



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,443	10/11/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920010169US1	9168

7590 03/04/2005

Marilyn Smith Dawkins
International Business Machines Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept., Internal Zip 4054
11400 Burnet Road,
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER

HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/975,443

Applicant(s)

DUTTA ET AL.

Examiner

Doug Hutton

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 28 October 2004, Applicant submitted a copy of the original oath, amended Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-9, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 12 August 2004.

The objection to the oath is withdrawn. The rejections for Claims 1-9 are withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "over a network" in Line 6 should be amended to — over the network — because the "network" is previously identified (see Claim 8, Line 4); and
- the phrase "displaying a list" in Line 11 should be amended to — displaying the list — because the "list" is previously identified (see Claim 8, Line 7).

Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase "displaying the a list" in Line 4 should be amended to — displaying the list — because it is unclear whether the term "a" has been deleted from the phrase.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Amro et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,757,370.

Claim 1:

Amro discloses a method for displaying portions a long document in a limited viewing area of a display on a client machine (see Figure 3; see Column 1, Lines 14-16; see Column 1, Lines 34-41; see Column 3, Line 57 through Column 4, Line 4; see Column 1, Lines 44-61 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus allows a user the user to quickly locate objects in a lengthy HTML document), comprising:

- retrieving a requested long document from a server communicatively connected over a network to the client (see Figures 2-4; see Column 2, Lines 30-31; see Column 2, Lines 56-59; see Column 3, Line 57 through Column 4, Line 4 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus displays lengthy HTML web pages retrieved from the Internet);
- in response to retrieving the document, parsing the document for tags identifying document components (see Figure 4; see Column 3, Line 57 through Column 4,

Line 4 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus scans each line of each page of the web page for HTML tags);

- in response to parsing the document, creating a list of identified document components, and storing the list in a cache (see Figure 4; see Column 4, Lines 5-8 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus creates an outline that defines the objects in the HTML document and stores the outline in memory);
- displaying a portion of the document in conjunction with a scroll bar (see Figure 3 – Amro discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure);
- in response to receiving a designated user action, displaying the list of identified document components (see Figures 3 and 5; see Column 4, Lines 30-50 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus displays in a mini window an outline for the HTML document in response to the user pressing and holding the second mouse button down over the elevator in the scroll bar); and
- in response to receiving a user selection of one of the identified document components within the list, displaying another portion of the document containing the selected identified document components (see Column 4, Lines 30-50 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus removes the mini window and scrolls the HTML document to the object corresponding to the position of the elevator in the scroll bar in response to the second mouse button being released).

Claim 2:

Amro discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein parsing the document for tags identifying document components further comprises parsing the document for tags identifying hyperlinks (see Figures 4 and 5; see Column 3, Line 28 through Column 4, Line 4 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus scans the entire HTML document, identifies every object in the document and includes each object of the document in the outline. Amro also discloses that the outline displays “text” and a “picture object.” The “text” in the HTML web page may be a hyperlink. Also, the “picture object” in the HTML web page may be a hyperlink icon. Thus, the object location apparatus parses the HTML document for “tags identifying hyperlinks.” Moreover, Amro also discloses that the outline displays objects that are not recognized. So, even if the object location apparatus does not recognize a hyperlink object, the hyperlink object is represented in the outline.); and wherein displaying the list of identified document components further comprises displaying identified hyperlinks in a visual association with the displayed document components (see Figure 3 – Amro discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure); and further comprising displaying another portion of the document containing a selected identified hyperlink in response to receiving a different user selection of one of the identified hyperlinks (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Amro discloses this limitation).

Claim 3:

Amro discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein the designated user action is a right mouse click within the scroll bar area (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Amro discloses this limitation).

Claim 5:

Amro discloses the method of Claim 1, further comprising removing the list from being displayed if a subsequent user action outside of the displayed list area is received (see Column 4, Lines 30-50 – Amro discloses this limitation in that it expressly recites that, when the user releases the second mouse button, the mini window is removed; this implies that the mini window is removed whenever the subsequent user action is inside or outside the mini window).

Claim 6:

Amro discloses a computer system having a limited viewing area display for displaying portions a long document (see Figures 2 and 3; see Column 1, Lines 14-16; see Column 1, Lines 34-41; see Column 3, Line 57 through Column 4, Line 4; see Column 1, Lines 44-61 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus allows a user the user to quickly locate objects in a lengthy HTML document), comprising:

- a browser application having means for retrieving a requested long document from a server communicatively connected over a network (see Figures 2-4; see

Column 2, Lines 30-31; see Column 2, Lines 56-59; see Column 3, Line 57 through Column 4, Line 4 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus displays lengthy HTML web pages retrieved from the Internet; Amro implies that a browser retrieves the compound document in that the GUI displayed in Figure 3 looks like a browser application and the object location apparatus scans HTML documents via the Internet, as expressly disclosed in Column 4, Line 2);

- in response to retrieving the document, means for parsing the document for tags identifying document components (see Figure 4; see Column 3, Line 57 through Column 4, Line 4 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus scans each line of each page of the web page for HTML tags);
- in response to parsing the document, means for creating a list of identified document components, and storing the list in a cache (see Figure 4; see Column 4, Lines 5-8 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus creates an outline that defines the objects in the HTML document);
- means for displaying a portion of the document in conjunction with a scroll bar (see Figure 3 – Amro discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure);
- in response to receiving a designated user action, means for displaying the list of identified document components (see Figures 3 and 5; see Column 4, Lines 30-50 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus displays in a mini window an outline for the HTML document in response to the user

pressing and holding the second mouse button down over the elevator in the scroll bar); and

- in response to receiving a user selection of one of the identified document components within the list, means for displaying another portion of the document containing the selected identified document components (see Column 4, Lines 30-50 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus removes the mini window and scrolls the HTML document to the object corresponding to the position of the elevator in the scroll bar in response to the second mouse button being released).

Claim 7:

Amro discloses the system of Claim 6, wherein the means for parsing the document for tags identifying document components further comprises means for parsing the document for tags identifying hyperlinks (see Figures 4 and 5; see Column 3, Line 28 through Column 4, Line 4 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus scans the entire HTML document, identifies every object in the document and includes each object of the document in the outline. Amro also discloses that the outline displays “text” and a “picture object.” The “text” in the HTML web page may be a hyperlink. Also, the “picture object” in the HTML web page may be a hyperlink icon. Thus, the object location apparatus parses the HTML document for “tags identifying hyperlinks.” Moreover, Amro also discloses that the outline displays objects that are not recognized. So, even if the object location apparatus does not

recognize a hyperlink object, the hyperlink object is represented in the outline.); and wherein the means for displaying the list of identified document components further comprises means for displaying identified hyperlinks in a visual association with the displayed list of document components (see Figure 3 – Amro discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure); and further comprising means for displaying another portion of the document containing a selected identified hyperlink in response to receiving a different user selection of one of the identified hyperlinks (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 6, Amro discloses this limitation).

Claim 8:

Amro discloses a computer program having computer readable program code means on a computer usable medium (see Figure 4; see Column 1, Lines 14-16; see Column 1, Lines 44-61; see Column 6, Lines 24-27 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location method comprises computer software for executing the method), comprising:

- instruction means for retrieving a document from a server communicatively connected over a network (see Figures 2-4; see Column 2, Lines 30-31; see Column 2, Lines 56-59; see Column 3, Line 57 through Column 4, Line 4 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus displays lengthy HTML web pages retrieved from the Internet);
- in response to retrieving the document, instruction means for parsing the document received over the network for tags identifying document components

(see Figure 4; see Column 3, Line 57 through Column 4, Line 4 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus scans each line of each page of the web page for HTML tags);

- in response to parsing the document, instruction means for creating a list of identified document components and instruction means for storing the list in a cache (see Figure 4; see Column 4, Lines 5-8 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus creates an outline that defines the objects in the HTML document);
- instruction means for displaying a portion of the document in conjunction with a scroll bar (see Figure 3 – Amro discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure);
- in response to receiving a designated user action, instruction means for displaying the list of identified document components (see Figures 3 and 5; see Column 4, Lines 30-50 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus displays in a mini window an outline for the HTML document in response to the user pressing and holding the second mouse button down over the elevator in the scroll bar); and
- in response to receiving a user selection of one of the identified document components within the list, instruction means for displaying another portion of the document containing the selected identified document components (see Column 4, Lines 30-50 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus removes the mini window and scrolls the HTML document to the

object corresponding to the position of the elevator in the scroll bar in response to the second mouse button being released).

Claim 9:

Amro discloses the computer program of Claim 8, wherein the means for parsing the document for tags identifying document components further comprises means for parsing the document for tags identifying hyperlinks (see Figures 4 and 5; see Column 3, Line 28 through Column 4, Line 4 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location method scans the entire HTML document, identifies every object in the document and includes each object of the document in the outline. Amro also discloses that the outline displays “text” and a “picture object.” The “text” in the HTML web page may be a hyperlink. Also, the “picture object” in the HTML web page may be a hyperlink icon. Thus, the object location method parses the HTML document for “tags identifying hyperlinks.” Moreover, Amro also discloses that the outline displays objects that are not recognized. So, even if the object location method does not recognize a hyperlink object, the hyperlink object is represented in the outline.); and wherein the means for displaying the list of identified document components further comprises means for displaying identified hyperlinks in a visual association with the displayed document components (see Figure 3 – Amro discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure); and further comprising means for displaying another portion of the document containing a selected identified hyperlink in response to

receiving a different user selection of one of the identified hyperlinks (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 8, Amro discloses this limitation).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuppusamy et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,769,096, in view of Amro, and further in view of Sotomayor, U.S. Patent No. 5,708,825.

Claim 4:

Kuppusamy discloses a method for displaying portions a long document in a limited viewing area of a display on a client machine (see Figure 4; see Column 1, Lines 14-16 and Column 2, Lines 6-9 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that the HTML frameset creation program displays a table of contents for a lengthy HTML document), comprising:

- retrieving a requested long document from a server communicatively connected over a network to the client (see Figure 2; see Column 10, Lines 9-34 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that the program retrieves HTML

documents that are browser-readable; the document in Figure 2 is a “long document”);

- in response to retrieving the document, parsing the document for tags identifying document components (see Column 10, Lines 9-19 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that, anytime an HTML document is loaded into a browser, the browser parses every tag in the document upon the browser’s retrieval of the document from the network; also, see Column 7, Lines 53-55 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that the program scans the document to identify headings *after* retrieving the document; thus, the program parses the document “in response to retrieving the document”);
- in response to parsing the document, creating a list of identified document components, and storing the list in a cache (see Figure 4; see Column 10, Lines 20-62 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that the program creates a frameset and a “table of contents” document, wherein the program parses the HTML document and inputs an entry into the “table of contents” document for each heading in the HTML document and stores the “table of contents” document in memory; thus, the program creates a “list” “in response to parsing the document” and stores the “list” in a “cache”);
- displaying a portion of the document in conjunction with a scroll bar (see Figure 4 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that the program displays only a portion of the HTML document in the display window, and implies that the remainder of the document is accessible through a scroll bar);

- in response to receiving a designated user action, displaying the list of identified document components (see Figure 4; see Column 6, Lines 56-59; see Column 10, Lines 20-62 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that the program, in response to a user selecting a “TOC in Frameset” option, creates the “table of contents” document); and
- in response to receiving a user selection one the identified document components within list, displaying another portion of document containing the selected identified document component (see Column 4, Lines 38-41 – Kuppusamy discloses this limitation in that the program, in response to a user clicking on a link in the “table of contents” document, displays the user-selected portion of the HTML document).

For purposes of examination, the examiner assumes that, through amendment the original claims to include the “in response” phrases of Steps 2 and 3 in the independent claims and through Applicant’s arguments, Applicant attempts to limit the scope of the present invention by specifying that the “creating” of the list recited in Claims 1, 6 and 8 is executed **automatically** upon retrieval of the long document, **without** the user opting to create the list. In that context, Kuppusamy fails to expressly disclose:

- automatically creating the list of identified document components and automatically saving the list in a cache; and

- subsequently displaying the created list only in response to a designated user action.

Amro teaches a method for displaying portions a long document in a limited viewing area of a display on a client machine (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Amro discloses this limitation), comprising:

- automatically creating the list of identified document components and automatically saving the list in a cache (see Figure 4; see Column 4, Lines 5-8; see Column 4, Lines 30-36 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the object location apparatus automatically creates an outline that defines the objects in the HTML document and automatically stores the outline in memory); and
- subsequently displaying the created list only in response to a designated user action (see Figure 4; see Column 4, Lines 5-8; see Column 4, Lines 30-36 – Amro discloses this limitation in that the apparatus displays the list only in response to the user clicking the second mouse button, as indicated in the cited figure and text),

for the purposes of creating the list in the background of the computer program so that the processing time in creating the list is obviated and allowing the user to choose when the list is displayed so that the maximum amount of the lengthy HTML document is viewable.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kuppusamy, to include:

- automatically creating the list of identified document components and automatically saving the list in a cache; and
- subsequently displaying the created list only in response to a designated user action,

for the purposes of creating the list in the background of the computer program so that the processing time in creating the list is obviated and allowing the user to choose when the list is displayed so that the maximum amount of the lengthy HTML document is viewable, as taught in Amro.

Kuppusamy, in view of Amro, fails to expressly disclose/teach:

- identified document components that are displayed in an alphabetical order.

Sotomayor teaches a method for displaying portions a long document (see Figure 3; see Column 1, Lines 6-13 – Amro teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text), comprising:

- identified document components that are displayed in an alphabetical order (see Column 13, Lines 47-52; see Column 14, Line 30 through Column 15, Line 3 – Sotomayor teaches this limitation in that the document modification program parses the document, identifies concepts and key phrases, and displays those document components in an alphabetical order),

in order to facilitate ordering of the document components in a multipage document so that a particular part of the document is easily located in the list (see Column 14, Lines 38-40).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kuppusamy, in view of Amro, to include:

- identified document components that are displayed in an alphabetical order, in order to facilitate ordering of the document components in a multipage document so that a particular part of the document is easily located in the list, as taught in Sotomayor.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1-3 and 5-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Arguments for Claim 4:

Claim 4 has a new grounds for rejection, but Applicant's arguments apply partly to the new rejection. Thus, the examiner will address Applicant's argument.

Applicant argues that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Kuppusamy and Sotomayor. Applicant also argues that there is no reasonable expectation of success in the combination of Kuppusamy and Sotomayor. Applicant provides no analysis for these assertions. See *Applicant's Response* – Page 13, fifth and sixth paragraphs.

The examiner disagrees.

As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 4, Sotomayor expressly teaches that the identified document components that are displayed in an alphabetical order in order to facilitate ordering of the document components in a multipage document so that a particular part of the document is easily located in the list.

Regarding expectation of success, Sotomayor is used solely to teach that the items of a list may be placed in alphabetical order. As demonstrated in Sotomayor, computer programmers have long known how to take the items of a list and put those items in alphabetical order. Performing this task in a computer program is extraordinarily simple.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2179

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
February 27, 2005


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER